CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXVI Nos. 7 & 8 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* July/August, 1985

THE SOVEREIGN UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

by DON BELL

We have pleasure in printing this exemplary exposure of the internationalist plot known as European Union by the distinguished American commentator, Don Bell.

One of the most important dreams of the One Worlders is about to become true. What today comprises the ten Sovereign States of Western Europe are to be replaced by a Regional World Government. The States themselves will disappear and be replaced by Regional Governments which will handle local affairs, similar to the ten Regional Governments that were designed to replace the fifty Sovereign States that make up the United States of America. The soon accomplishment of this dream first came to our notice when it was announced the time-honoured British passport will become a thing of the past, to be replaced by a European Union passport. This will be a hard thing for British patriots to stomach. As the European Community's magazine *Europe* admits: "Resplendent in deep oceanic blue and regally embossed with the monarch's coat of arms, the British passport is as evocative to its owners of their nationality as scarlet mailboxes or the bowler hat. Inside, the warning that 'Her Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State . . . requests and requires the bearer to pass without let or hindrance' is almost as sacred to a Briton as the pursuit of happiness is to a U.S. patriot." But that symbol of British Sovereignty will pass away; as will the sovereignty and national passports of France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Greece, and Spain and Portugal when the latter become a part of the European Community on January 1, 1986. The passport, the symbol of national and individual sovereignty, will then be issued by a Regional World Government.

The next thing to be brought to our attention was the news that, on February 14, 1984, the Assembly of the European Community had voted by a large majority for a draft treaty which will establish in fact a Sovereign United States of Europe. This treaty calls for the setting up of a new "Union of Europe" with autonomous powers to achieve monetary, economic, pollitical and fiscal union. In other words, complete integration into a Regional World Government is to be accomplished. Of course, this will not be an immediate creation. The people of the ten Nations of Europe must be coerced gradually. So ten years are determined for the total integration. We might mention that originally this plan was to include the United States as a part of the merger. That's what the Atlantic Alliance and the plan for "Union Now" with Britain was all about. But this seemed impractical politically and the idea was replaced by the Trilateral Commission, which is primarily an *economic* union, rather than a political coalition. Now the plan of the One Worlders seems to call for the eventual creation of an All-the-Americas Regional World Government, to match that of Europe, of the Eurasian Communist Region, and the Eastasia Third World group (we used Orwell's names in this connection).

Soviet-Type Euro-Union

Because this draft treaty setting up a Regional World Government in Europe is so very similar to the plans of some One Worlders for the establishment of a Regional World Government of the Americas, it's important to note its provisions. Miss Margaret Crawford, a British patriot writing in *Candour*, the British Views-Letter, explains: "When one examines in detail the draft Treaty establishing European Unity, one finds that there is a close similarity with the 1977 Constitution of the USSR (which replaced all previous constitutions for the USSR). This similarity is sufficiently close to make it incompatible with any suggestion that Soviet-type activities of the executive of the European Union would be excluded . . . According to Article 5 of the draft Treaty, 'The territory of the Union shall consist of all the territories of member states . . . That is, whoever controls the Union would control our national territories. According to Article 6, the Union 'may acquire and dispose of movable property and immovable property.' According to Article 42 'The laws of the Union shall be directly applicable to the Member States. It shall take precedence over national law.' The draft Treaty provides for the transition from national member States to a totally integrated European Union, this to take ten years. The Com-

missioners (of the European Union) would take over the functions previously performed by national governments and the Western European Monarchies. Instead, under the Commission, there would be Regions to handle local matters. *Since the intentions spelt out in the draft Treaty include: a) Seizure of the territories of the nation; b) Seizure of national assets for use by foreign rulers; c) The establishment of alien laws, imposed by alien rulers; d) The removal of all authority from Parliament, and e) The removal of all constitutional functions from the Monarch, (and) since these are the objectives that are commonly sought in the pursuit of war, those promoting that Treaty must be considered to be conspiring to levy war directly against the Queen, albeit a cold war, for the purposes stated above."*

Miss Crawford calls this treason. In the same context, those who are conspiring to create a New World Order in which the United States would be one of many Regions, should also be considered traitors who are conspiring to wage war against the Nation and its Constitutional Government.

Age-Old Conspiracy

But let's go back in history and trace the development of this conspiracy against all Nations. In the same year that the Declaration of Independence was signed, and Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* published, there was also produced a plan calling for the setting up of a World State. Among the most important requirements stated in this Manifesto of the Order of the Illuminati were: the abolition of the family; the abolition of countries and nationalities; the abolition of "religious liberty and freedom of conscience," and the destruction of the then existing social and political order. This plan to set up a World Government suffered something of a decline until the middle of the last century when the Communist Karl Marx and the Capitalist Frederich Engels wrote for the Communist League a new *Manifesto*. Marx was a student of Weishaupt, the creator of the Order of the Illuminati. He also was a student of Hegel, the German philosopher who "shook the world" with his theories of dialectical and historical materialism, his idea that the State is God, and his Hegelian formula (thesis versus antithesis produces synthesis) which has become the golden rule of all planners of the New World Order, whether they be Marxist, Capitalist, or any other type of internationalist. Marx, taking his theses from Weishaupt, Hegel, Saint-Simon, Feuerbach, and other socialistically inclined philosophers, he agreed with Engels in the dictum: "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways. The time has come to change it." James Billington, in his book *Fire in the Minds of Men* which deals with "origins of the Revolutionary Faith," states "The cruciol new element that Marx brought to communism was dialectical materialism. Here at last was a finished revolutionary ideology with a dynamic historical outlook . . . Karl Marx remained basically a Hegelian intellectual."

But Marxism, or Communism, remained a kind of underground, not yet greatly important movement until the early part of the present century when the planners of the World State envisioned Communism as a competitor to Capitalism on a worldwide scale. To state it in Hegelian terms, One Worlders saw Communism as the *antithesis* to the *thesis* Capitalism, out of which struggle would be developed the *synthesis,* or the New World Order in which economics would replace politics, Humanism would replace all other religions, and collectivism would replace individualsm. So, with the deliberate creation of World War I, came the emergence of a group of revolutionaries under Lenin who would be financed and encouraged to conquer Russia and make of it a base for the development of a worldwide "antithetical" force which would compete with the Capitalistic "thesis". By the year 1928, the Bolshevik invaders had successfully conquered Russia and established a Soviet Union, this through the aid of Megabankers and internationalist monopoly capitalists such as Armand Hammer, Averell Harriman, the Rockefellers, etc. Feeling secure by this time, the Communist International then presented its three-stage plan for achieving world government: "Socialize the economies of all nations; bring about *regional unions* of various groupings of these socialized nations; amalgamate all of these *regional groupings* into a final world-wide union of socialist states." In 1936 a somewhat revised program of the Communist International was issued, which stated that "Dictatorship can be established only by a victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries after which the proletariat republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence and this system of federal unions would expand . . . at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics." All of this was in line with the plans of the Master Conspirators who fed and nourished Communism and sought to use it for their own purposes.

In 1942, when Stalin was cooperating with the Master Conspirators in forming the United Nations, he defined the intermediate goals of Communism as: a) Confuse, disorganize and destroy the forces of (free enterprise) capitalism around the world; b) bring all nations together into a single world system

of economy; c) Force the advanced countries to pour prolonged financial aid into the under-developed countries; d) *Divide the world into regional groups as a transitional stage to total world government.* Populations will more readily abandon their national loyalties to a vague regional loyalty than to a world authority: e) Later the regional groups can be brought all the way into a world dictatorship." Stalin offers two courses: 1) Bring all nations together into a world system of economy; or 2) Divide the world into regional groups as a transitional stage to total world government. It should be noted that the Soviet plan coincides almost exactly with the Western plan. In the CFR, TLC, Bilderberger, Club of Rome, and other elitist organizations there is this same division. One group believes the creation of *Regional* World Governments is unnecessary; that with the proper use of pressure, power, persuasion and money, the time will come when the people of the various Nations will call for the creation of a world government "to end wars and preserve peace"; or that the making of more Declarations, Conventions, Treaties, Agencies dispensing various kinds of World Law (Seabed Treaty, Declarations of Human Rights, Genocide Conventions, New International Economic Programmes, etc.), will develop a world government as a matter of what they call "piecemeal functionalism". On the other hand, there are those among the "elitists" who are convinced that the creation of *Regional* World Governments must come first (because "populations will more readily abandon their national loyalties to a vague regional loyalty than to a world authority."). Now notice how this "difference of opinion" among Western Planners coincides with the differences of experts in the Kremlin. Compare the following which was published in the Oct. 3 *Intelligence Digest*:

"There is no doubt any longer that the Kremlin is a very divided house today with its occupants at loggerheads over just about everything. It is some time since there has been any agreement on policy. Yet another example of it has come to the surface. It concerns Moscow's attitude towards Western Europe. The fundamental poser is this: What is preferable . . . a divided Western Europe or a united Western Europe? Two draft policies have been prepared for consideration by the Politburo. One states categorically that a united Western Europe . . . is an objective to be pursued by every Soviet move towards any West European country over the next few years .The other states equally categorically that a divided Western Europe, in which one country after the other can be picked off by Moscow, should be a primary objective of Soviet policy for the next few years . . . These rival experts cannot agree . . . The declared objective of both is to separate Western Europe from the US — either Western Europe collectively as a united bloc, or the individual West European countries one by one. The one point on which they agree is that the objective is attainable, sooner or later. No West European leader should forget this."

Which side will win? Remember that a while ago there was an intensive campaign to cajole West Germany into a more comfortable relationship with Communist East Germany. At its height, the conferences were called off, at the order from the Kremlin. So, it would seem that both the so-called Western "elitists" and the Soviet "experts" are in total agreement: Western Europe collectively — as a united bloc, a Regional World Government — is the goal to be pursued. Whether there are enough patriots and lovers of their own country to prevent such a development is moot. Certainly the patriots of Britain are opposing the potential loss of their Queen and their Kingdom. The citizens of the other nine countries comprising the European Community may resist if warned in sufficient time.

Don Bell edits a weekly newsletter, "Don Bell Reports". Like "Candour", it is in its 32nd year of publication. For a sample copy, please send one pound to "Don Bell Reports," Post Office Box 2223, Palm Beach, Florida 33480, U.S.A.

A. K. CHESTERTON'S

COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

now available at **50p**

including postage

TREASON!

SAVE OUR COUNTRY FROM EUROPEAN SLAVERY

Alert the public to the fact that supporting European Union is treason.

Send for our special poster.

Only £1 for 20 from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

THE EFFRONTERY OF "THE MAIL ON SUNDAY"

You cannot hope to bribe or twist,
Thank God, the British journalist.
But seeing what the man will do
Unbribed — there's no occasion to!

— Humbert Wolfe.

The Sunday edition of the *Daily Mail* announced a startling discovery on July 21st in a lead story covering all the front page and extending to over half of page four (pages two and three were occupied by a story about how "Jim fixed it for Di" and an advert. for "low-cost loans" whereby you borrow £11,000 and pay back over £24,000; more on usury anon). *The Mail's* "scoop" purported to expose the existence in London of "an ultra-right wing Italian terrorist group", which it was claimed is linked to 'the British Fascist Movement". No such body as the "British Fascist Movement" has ever been heard of, but it seems that what *The Mail* was really driving at, of course, was the National Front. It is a particularly odd label for this Fleet Street organ to bestow on the N.F. when the latter spends so much time nowadays claiming a lineage back to the Distributist philosophy of G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc. However, we all know that journalists insist on exercising their licence as liberally as possible whenever any mention of the National Front is involved.

We are inclined to wonder whether the same is not true of "the Italian cell", as *The Mail* put it. The Rome Government (which one of the many recent administrations, we're not too sure) indeed has tried to have these young dissentients given the heave-ho, but as no less an incontrovertible "anti-fascist" source as Gerry Gable's *Searchlight* admitted in its March 1982 issue, extradition proceedings ended "with the cases against them being thrown out". Apparently, after hearing the Italian state prosecution's evidence, which was based largely on the unsworn testimony of Ulster-type "super-grasses", Bow Street beaks dismissed the case without even waiting to hear what defence counsel had to say. When they were living in Italy in the 1970's, *The Mail* said, the young men had belonged to a small organisation called the "Terza Posizione" or "Third Position", which for all its alleged sins was described as being "against Communism *and* Capitalism". So occasionally the truth *will* out, even in a newspaper!

Well, after a lot of third-rate cloak-and-dagger stuff about "gangs that would kill without hesitation" and "shelters and safe houses for comrades on the run", which is of no earthly concern to *Candour*, *The Mail*'s "exclusive" piece concluded with a brief claim that several "secret training camps" had been held at "a large estate at Liss in the New Forest owned by a veteran member of the ultra-right, Rosine de Bounevialle". *The Mail*'s sense of geography is as rampant as its imagination! But it is not only the newspaper's proclivity for distortion, which would have amazed even Humbert Wolfe, that I object to: it is the bare-faced effrontery with which it sought to deceive me in its grubbing about for a story. Hence the formal complaint that I have lodged with the Press Council, which is set out below.

COMPLAINT TO THE PRESS COUNCIL

I wish to complain to the Press Council about the reference to me contained in the concluding two paragraphs of *The Mail on Sunday*'s leading story, "Sanctuary", on July 21st, 1985, and the means by which two of the newspaper's representatives gained access to my house for an interview.

The facts are as follows:

On the afternoon of Wednesday, July 17th, a man and a woman called here at Forest House. The man said he was from *The Mail on Sunday* and was researching a piece for his newspaper on "youth in education".

I replied, "If it is 'youth' you are researching, aren't you at the wrong end of the spectrum? I am 69 years old!"

The man said, "I understand you run an academy."

"Yes, I do," I said. "It is called the A. K. Chesterton Academy."

"Could you tell us something about it?" he asked.

I saw no harm in asking them in and they were shown into the drawing room, where they sat down. I asked what they wanted to know.

"Who comes to the A. K. Chesterton Academy?"

"Anyone who want to," I said ."I teach history and facts about current affairs that no-one hears of or learns in present-day schools — or, indeed, anywhere connected with the Establishment."

"Don't you have para-military training and people from the National Front here?" the man asked, glancing out of the window 'significantly', as I am sure modern journalism would put it.

"Of course I don't!" I laughed. "I have told you what we teach and we have been going on about for thirty years since my journal's inception. You have only to look at my record, We live in a usurous society, so I try to dissuade anyone from voting for a politician who doesn't admit this. Perhaps you don't

know what usury it — it is lending money on unprofitable exercises which means that the borrowers will never be able to repay it."

Then I fecthed a copy of a 'mini-saga' that I had written, inspired by the *Sunday Telegraph*'s magazine competition. He asked if I had sent it in. I said that I didn't waste the stamp. Nevertheless, I emphasised, *"that* is what we teach."

My 'mini-saga' runs as follows:

Whatever Happened to Merrie England?

Mother Church owned most of the land. The peasants rented and cultivated it to their good. Christ the King ruled through Church and State. Coinage was royal and free. Monarch, lords and commons lived, learned and worshipped in wellbeing.

Then usurers returned claiming everyone's interest.

Now, Debt rules the ruins.

"Oh!" said the reporter, "Doesn't that involve the Jews?"

"Yes, indeed it does. In the Middle Ages, the Jews were the only usurers, although it was wrong for the Christians, as well, to borrow in the usury sense. King Edward I tried, but could not stop them, so in the end he got rid of the Jews. They took all their bag and baggage with them. After that, for three hundred years the value of money didn't alter."

The Mail on Sunday's reporter then asked if I had people from Europe to stay at Forest House. I said I was in communication with France and Germany, where some of my journal's subscribers live.

"And Italy?" he asked.

"Ah!" said I. "I thought we would arrive at Italians eventually!"

"They are terrorists," he insisted.

"No," I said, "they are *not* terrorists."

"Do you know Robert Fiore [*sic*]?" I was asked.

"Yes," I said.

"Do you know Marcello de Angelis and Nick Griffin?" he asked.

"Yes," I said, "and neither of them are terrorists."

"Oh, they have been here?"

"Yes," I said, "they have been here, but not for nearly two years."

"They are convicted terrorists," announced *The Mail on Sunday*'s man.

"In Italian courts they may be," I replied, "but the rules of evidence in Italy won't stand up in an *English* court. If they could have been convicted by English law, they would have been extradited long ago. Only yesterday, some Labour M.P. said that since the miners accused of rioting on the picket lines were so comprehensively acquitted, it was wrong of the Government to allow them to be charged."

After that exchange, I gave *The Mail* representatives a bit more information on usury and then got up to show them out. The girl, who had said nothing at all until then, said, "May I take some pictures of you?"

I said I didn't mind since I wasn't photogenic but was past vanity! She produced her camera and clicked away very professionally. She then asked if we could go outside, where she repeated the performance on my terrace with the house in the background.

I said, "Shall I see any of these?' '

She replied, "Of course, we'll send you some." The two then departed.

Now — my complaint against *The Mail on Sunday* is that deception was used to gain admittance to my house in order to interview me. It was what is called, I believe, lying by inference. Clearly, the actual newspaper report last Sunday shows that the journalist had *no intention whatsoever* of writing an article on "youth in education" or the role that the A. K. Chesterton Academy has played in this objective.

The *real* intention was solely to secure an admission from me that two young Italians had visited my home in an effort to substantiate the completely false allegation that they had participated in what *The Mail* chooses to describe as "training camps". I take it that only the fear of litigation prevented the newspaper from repeating its reporter's ridiculous and actionable comment about *"para-military* training". I have *no* links with para-military or terrorist organisations, and any attempt even to suggest otherwise is an outrageous and unfounded smear.

ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE Editor, *Candour.*

BOOKS FROM FOREST HOUSE

Isabella The Crusader by William Walsh, £1.25

We believe Walsh to be one of the finest historians-in-depth of this century. He exposes the reality of events and the forces causing them, some of which no other historian has unearthed. This extremely valuable and difficult to obtain book tells how Queen Isabella of Castile rid her country of the Moors and used the Inquisition with success against malefactors.

Christ Denied by Rev. Paul Wickens, £1

An exposure of those who caused the turmoil in the Catholic Church today, focussing on George Tyrrell, Teilhard de Chardin and Karl Rahner. Fr. Wickens traces the confusion of our times directly to their ideas and shows what we must do to combat them.

HOSTAGES TO INTERNATIONALISM ?

Yesterday we heard the arrival of the released American hostages back in the U.S.A., with the band playing *The Stars and Stripes* at their reception and the President there in person, complete with speech.

In view of earlier messages we'd heard from these survivors, including one from *the pilot* after they'd left Beirut, I wonder if you had the same thought as I? That is, not many "Privates of the Buffs" among 'em, eh? Looks as if the only possible candidate for that accolade didn't survive — all same original.

But then I had the distinct impression that that poem would be considered disgustingly *racist* (ugh!) by this troop of *un*conquering non-heroes who disembarked in "The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave", while the band played the anthem which includes those words. But, in fairness to the author of the anthem, the thing is posed as a *question*: "Oh say, does the Star-spangled Banner *still* wave o'er the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave?" (Emphasis mine; the author thought the question was rhetorical.) After all, the anthem is a bit out-of-date itself!

But if this party of (all-male, remember) citizens of what were once King George's North American Colonies would hotly repudiate any fellow-feeling with that stupid Private of the Buffs, be not surprised! I bet they would even repudiate any sympathy with the White Racists (and we have *that* on the authority of Mugabe himself) who recently voted for "Good Old Smithy", although these fall far short of that Buffs' Private. But who can blame a chance collection of T.W.A. passengers and crew, now that it's far too late to admonish them to do otherwise. (*What* else?)

"Will they never learn?" is more appropriately applied to the South Africans who look like coming to the same end as the Private of the Buffs, but without the glory. However, that's a collective verdict. Individually, there will always be cases of glory — even in England!

ARTHUR PURNELL.

IN PASSING

The software was auspicious
In the finding of the bride;
The groom — a mite suspicious
Of what the chips might hide?

The lady, much more trusting
That the hardware would come-up
With a fella' somewhat lusting
To complete the loving-cup!

The choices are infinite
In a computer run
To find the key to wedlock
And, Marry! Be undone.

Gone is childhood sweetheart-time,
Teen-age questing at the dance;
The printed-circuit more sublime
Than brash boy or coquettish glance.

Data, cater for inaction,
Hold my hand — but proxily
Simulate the keen attraction
Of opposites, magnetically.

B. E. BIGGS.

ON THE LEVEL ?

We note with regret the death of Mr. Stephen Knight, author of the best-selling book *The Brotherhood,* which exposed the infiltration of the police, judiciary, Civil Service, Army and local government by Freemasons. Is there any significance, we muse, in the fact that he died aged 33?

BOOKS WANTED

We are anxious to purchase or borrow for photo-copying the following books:

THE BOLSHEVIKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY
Apionus (Britons, 1923)

CALL OF THE SWORD
Dr. J. Clarke (London, 1917)

LETTERS FROM PALESTINE
B. Pullen-Burry (—)

JEWS AND THE WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC
Joseph Banister (Britons, —)

THE SATANIZATION OF RUSSIA
B. Jensen (—)

If you have any of these books, please write to: Candour Research Department, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

EXEMPLARY POLAND

by ABBE GEORGES DE NANTES

With the promotion of Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, Archibishop of Cracow, to the Sovereign Pontificate, Poland has found herself at the forefront of the world stage. Firstly in her traditional role as harshly oppressed and persecuted Catholic nation. That was in 1978. Then under the influence of John-Paul II's teaching in defence of man and Human Rights, she very soon acquired another role, that of Solidarnosc. And from having exalted a traditional, classic, Catholic Poland, united, disciplined, hierarchical and rural too, contained within the bounds of legality, the world, both Right and Left, came to exalt *another* Poland. This other Poland is that of the democrat intellectuals and clerics, that of the workers, Catholic or not, that of the trade unions, more or less tolerated, recognized or banned by the official Church and by the Communist State. It is the Poland of the young generation, the freedom lovers, whose idol was the Pope and whose incarnation was Walesa in August 1980.

Through the workers kneeling on the ground of their naval dockyards to confess to serious looking, fairhaired young priests in surplice and stole with the police hemming them in and threatening them, resistance, subversion, unionist insurrection, both revolutionary and patriotic, has once more recovered its title to Polish and evangelical nobility beneath the Pope's blessing.

The world has been edified, moved and even thrilled by all this. As a result, for nearly five years the world has come to regard what was bad as good, what was crazy as wise, what was forbidden as permitted so that the rule of social, moral and Christian order has thereby been changed in a hundred countries of the world. Until the dramatic climax was reached with the assassination by the political police of the young and stirring Father Popieluszko. The trial of his murderers, henceforth known as the Torun trial, has however begun to effect a change in public opinion. Articles in well informed newspapers and reviews have begun to make the more attentive public aware of the enormous mystification practised on the entire world. I am not alone in denouncing it. Let us hope that this awakening of public opinion will reach all levels of society and all the world's capitals to lead the politics of peoples away from the libertarian follies exemplified by the *false* Catholic Poland of Solidarnosc to the political and moral realism taught in the meanwhile, and still more clearly today, by the exemplary Poland of all time, that of Cardinal Glemp . . . and of General Jaruzelski.

Strange "Solidarnosc"!

The famous trade union led by Lech Walesa, and so much blessed by John-Paul II, is better understood today, even by the very blind. It is a popular insurrectional movement, *apparently* Catholic, brought into being, organized and *infiltrated* by atheists, Jews and trotskyites with a view to tearing the Polish masses away from the established communist regime and away from submission to their bishops, the defenders of the Church's freedom. With the financial and ideological help of international freemasonry, the aim is to destabilize and paganize the most Catholic country in central Europe.

The proof is to be found in this revealing article which appeared in *La Croix* for 29th January. They tell it to our faces now that the veil has fallen: Solidarnosc was not the picture of Epinal we were made to admire and aid so much:

Polish Itinerary

"All those who were fortunate enough to attend the talk on Poland at the Sorbonne on 11th November 1982 will not have forgotten the intervention of the Nobel prize winner, Czeslaw Milosz, nor his conclusion about the state of the century: 'Man is summoned to capitulate.' What predominated in this high level talk was really the capacity for resistance to all threats of all times, that value, so frail and so strong at one and the same time, which figures as both the prize and the victim of the prevailing ideologies and totalitarianisms: man.

"Now, the impact of the Polish adventure on Western consciousness was that of a people, of a nation, of a Church, of a trade union: collective entities, of which the Walesas and John-Paul II's were, after all, no more than emanations (sic!). It would be paradoxical, however, to forget that the fight for man was also the fight of each of its protagonists. Three witnesses have opportunely reminded us in these days that Poland is not simply that homogeneous crowd whose self assurance has been portrayed in the news of recent years, but it is also the sum total of a multitude of individual commitments that defy reduction to such collective images.

"The book by Seweryn Blumsztajn, Solidarity's representative in Paris since December 1981,

illustrates this point. Catholic and Polish for ever? Not at all. Solidarnosc comes from the 'red scouts' of the 50's, the crucible of anti religious and stalinist communism. Its leftist political commitment is comparable to Jacek Guron's, and, like him, is a co-founder of KOR. What is more, his family is Jewish and he himself asserts this Jewishness even when reacting 'very aggressively' (sic) to any French Jew who talks to him of 'the Poles' anti semitism'. His approach is what Adam Michnik had called 'dialogue between the Church and the left', without which Solidarity — of whose perfect representative Blumsztajn is — would never have seen the light of day.

"Another militant, Edmund Baluka, made the same choice in April 1981 after ten years of exile, and with the same risks. Baluka, a rebellious worker found himself almost by chance heading the strike at the naval dockyards of Szczecin in January 1971. He is not a Catholic either. He is an internationalist (from Paris, he directed the aid to the free trade unions of Eastern Europe, all nations indiscriminately) and close to the trotskyists. He advocates an authentic workers' revolution including the withdrawal of soviet troops from Poland and the eviction of the party in power from Warsaw, which even the extremists of KOR and of Solidarity have always been careful to say nothing about, from a sense of realism.

"A courageous man, Baluka has obviously experienced prison, trial and clashes with the political police. He is fighting so that his wife, who is French, and his son can join him in Poland. His *Letters from Prison*, which are moving though awkward, reveal an itinerary that has nothing to do with the banalities about a unanimous Poland.

"Finally, the adventure of young Jerzy Popieluszko, whose own initiative is no less valuable than his sermons, reminds us that the power of the Polish Catholic Church rests mainly on the faith and the courage of all these rank and file priests who are engaged in a fierce struggle for man's freedom and dignity. Even unto death, sometimes.

"Let us not make of Poland a picture of Epinal. The Poles are not all alike; far from it. It is precisely to have their multiple and complex identity recognized that they are fighting."

For still further proof, there is this other article from *La Croix* for 7th February, which completes our information about all the cogs and moving parts of Solidarnosc, which for five years has been depicted, despite my protests, as a Catholic (!) workers (!) patriotic (!) movement, as wise as it is innocent (!).

Seweryn Blumsztajn Returns Home

"On 5th February, Seweryn Blumsztajn will hold a press conference at Orly airport before boarding the plane for Poland after three years of exile. In returning home, he runs the risk of seeing himself welcomed at Warsaw by an armed car . . .

"Seweryn Blumsztajn is 38 years old. Born just after the war into a Jewish family which, in 1968, was to suffer from the antisemitic policy of the Polish Government, Blumsztajn interrupted his studies in sociology that same year. From March 1968 to July 1969, he was in prison as were other former "red scouts" who had gone over to opposition militancy: Adam Michnik, Jacek Kuron, Karol Modzelewski, etc.

"Granted an amnesty, he continued his studies, thanks to the hospitality of the Catholic University of Lublin, whilst remaining a political activist. In 1976, after the riots of Rakom and Ursus, he found himself among the co-founders of KOR (Committee for the Defence of Workers) that handful of intellectuals drawn from various backgrounds, convinced of the need to establish links of solidarity between the democratic opposition and the world of work (ah!). The explosion in August 1980 and the birth of Solidarity fulfilled the hopes of these pioneers: it was no accident if the same Kuron, Michnik and Modzelewski found themselves at the forefront of the Solidarity venture, not without occasional clashes with the more moderate members of the new trade union.

"Blumsztajn, who was directing Solidarity's information agency in Warsaw found himself cornered in France at the time of Jaruzelski's coup de force in December 1981. From that date, he then created and directed *Solidarity's Information Bulletin* in France, esteemed by all journalists for its quality and interest, especially during the early months of the 'state of war'.

"But Blumsztajn wishes to 'return home' where he has his place, as he explains in his book. He wishes to do so without bending to the demands of power, which is why he has waited for the expiry date of his amnesty (31st December) in order to programme his return. It is a symbolic gesture that could very well land him in trouble, now that those in power seem to be stiffening their attitude towards over active militants . . ."

In fact, the international agitator Blumsztajn was put back on the plane to Paris for not having his papers in order, to cries of indignation from all the world's 'bien-pensants'; only *Valeurs actuelles* has dared to publish the true thinking of this Blumsztan as he was preparing to return to Poland. It is

because his true thoughts do not fit into the pattern of received ideas. Judge for yourselves, bearing in mind what I have been saying for several years: If anyone deserves the Nobel Peace Prize, it is General Jaruzelski, testified to yesterday by the agitator Seweryn Blumsztajn:

The "Block Heads"

"At Torun, General Jaruzelski was able to eliminate his adversaries. M. Seweryn Blumsztajn comments on the Torun trial for *Valeurs actuelles.*

— This trial will soften the image of General Jaruzelski and of those who surround him: it shows in effect that there are worse. Father Popieluszko's assassins were not isolated. Now, Jaruzelski has always said that he was the rampart against the hardliners, against those whom we call the 'block-heads' in Poland.

— In your book, you describe the people who surround Jaruzelski as liberals.

— 'Liberals' in inverted commas. People like Rakowski, the deputy prime minister, or Urban the General's spokesman, call themselves liberals, and even Europeans. But the distinction between 'moderates' and 'hard-liners' is an invention of the sovietologists. In Poland, the real distinction is that which divides society from power. Whether one belongs to the 'hardliner' clan or to the other is determined by the historical situation. Before 1981, Olszowski, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was a liberal. Today he is a 'block-head'.

"The people in power today are pragmatists. They are more flexible. Also more cynical. These people have renounced all idea of ideological legitimacy: they wish to hold on to power for the sake of power [*or perhaps for the salvation of the Polish nation, if I may dare to contradict the trotskyite agitator*]. Communist ideology takes second place. [*This is the most precious admission, showing up a nationalist General Jaruzelski and a true head of State*].

"And in order to govern, they need a stable situation. But what is paradoxical, to say the least, is that the government forbids strikes and important demonstrations but allows opposition activity to develop in press articles and books, etc. More and more tolerance is to be observed on the part of the authorities. And people no longer hesitate to sign their articles, books or manifestos with their names.

— What are the lessons to be drawn from this trial?

— First of all, the authorities have controlled it admirably. There was no skidding: nothing was said that could threaten those in power. And behind the scenes, Jaruzelski took advantage of the trial to purge the police. More important for society, that feeling of all powerfulness and impunity, which may have been enjoyed by the militia, should now have disappeared. Any police agent tempted to commit such an act will wonder about his impunity.

— Do the accused risk the gallows?

— Yes. There are on average ten executions a year in Poland. Why not of police?

— You are going back to Poland this Tuesday. What are you going to do there?

— My plans stop at the airport. At the police station."

(*Valeurs actuelles* — 4th February 1985).

Parallel with this, there is an article by Phillipe Krazsnopolski, "The necessary sacrifice", which completes the picture of Jaruzelski as a very discreet, cautious and strong head of State, knowing how to use the narrow margin for manoeuvre left to him in order to save Poland from a destabilization hoped for by the whole world, the USSR (and East Germany even more!) on the one hand, and the democratic, liberal world on the other. He discouraged popular insurrection following the assassination of the *Solidarnosc chaplain,* first victory. Today, he is strangling the omnipotence of the KGB in the Polish police under cover of the trial, calmly brought to its conclusion, of the murderers, members of the sinister political police. Second victory, which has a touch of the miraculous about it. He could not have done that without the wisdom and exemplary loyalty of Cardinal Glemp, of the entire Polish episcopate by all their people, thus avoiding the worst.

A Very Wise Speech

Those of our friends who listen to our monthly news review will know that during the second papal visit to Poland, John-Paul II had his outlook changed by the General and the Cardinal, and that before his departure for Rome he too had changed Lech Walesa's mind, as we told you at the time. We have proof, implicit, of course, of the Pope's change of outlook from a little speech he gave to the Poles in Rome for Christmas (Doc. Cath. 3 February, p.175-177). It was a very wise speech, of purely classic morality, ecclesiastical discipline, full of true religion, submission to the authority of the Church's Pastors and obedience to the National State. In other words, it was unusual. It was a change from calls to insurrection in the name of human rights, to liberation for justice and equality, to the preferential option for the poor in view of the whole man's integral development. When he goes to the Philippines, to Peru, to Salvador and to New Caledonia it would be good if the Pope of Human rights gave way to the Polish Pope and adopted this new, truly patriotic and truly Christian, language, renouncing that of the revolu-

tionary and materialist demagogue. But here are the remarkable elements of this speech.

After having exalted the Motherland and wished her well, the Pope then recalled Father Popieluszko in terms that were truly neutral and cool accompanied by chosen quotations from among the more anodyne of his sermons.

That was in order quickly to steer away from the assassinated Solidarnosc chaplain to the Polish bishops who also "recall and ceaselessly demand respect for man's fundamental rights" examples of which the Pope skilfully selects, such as the right "to have a crucifix in believers' work and study places" . . .

And John Paul II straight away celebrates, with quotations from the Polish bishops' pastoral letter for 6th December last, the Cross of Jesus Christ! Then he enters into the essential part of his speech. It is a call not to subversion nor even to the struggle against official atheism but to the conversion of the Polish Catholic people, *"from their national weaknesses, sins and failing"*. It was an unusually classic trilogy or tetralogy: a sort of Work, Family, Motherland, Religion instead of the usual revolutionary slogans: Rights, Liberation, Equality, Universal Fraternity etc.

Mistaking The Target

Our conclusion is simple. For five years, the French Right (the Left knows very well what it is doing) has mistaken the target. For the Right, the man to defeat in Poland is Jaruzelski and his stooge Cardinal Glemp. The holy man is Lech Walesa; Solidarnosc is the hope of Poland and a lesson for all the world. In this perspective, Father Popieluszko is one of those martyrs whose sacrifice heralds the triumph of the cause for which they died. In this case, the cause of Man.

It would not be long, world opinion dreamed, before the Polish people broke their chains and experienced the delights of unionist freedoms, the right to strike, collective bargaining, paid holidays etc. of direct democracy and national independence reconquered. Following Poland's example, the colonized peoples, the oppressed masses, conscientized by their Christian militants and chaplains, grouped into base communities freed from hierarchical restraint, would begin their long march towards Freedom, the Promised Land led by a charismatic Pope, messias of the new times, their Liberator. Today, that has been done in Argentina, in Uruguay, in Brazil, in Nicaragua as in China. It is in the course of being done in Salvador and Peru. Next, it will be done in Chile, in the Philippines, in Namibia and in New Caledonia! Finally, acting on the Polish model, the Church will have opened the way throughout the world towards a non-marxist, non-violent, but charismatic, evangelical social-democracy. And all social or customary ecclesiastical and political powers opposed to it will be swept away.

That is what it means to mistake the target. The error hit one in the eyes when both Right and Left, world opinion in general, immediately and without the least hesitation attributed Father Popieluszko's murder to General Jaruczelski . . . with the complicity of Cardinal Glemp. Such a mistake can only be explained by mad passion. I denounced the true author of the crime on the day itself, and I have found confirmation of my judgement in one of the final and most pathetic moments of the Torum trial. It was a sacred moment when there was total unanimity in the room, from prosecution to defence benches, from the judges to the victim's parents, all except the murderers, whose silence was the plainest admission.

"A lawyer, relates Noöl Darbroz of *La Croix,* Mr. Jan Olszewski, a former Solidarity expert, stigmatized attorney Pietrasincki's indictment and developed the thesis of an act of provocation aimed at starting a cycle of terror between those in authority and the opposition.

"He let it be understood that in his eyes the four accused police agents were not the only ones involved in the assassination of the priest. 'Who can have an interest in weakening Poland? All our children know the answer' said the lawyer without specifying the country he was thinking of. But the whole room could have answered: the Soviet Union."

Once again, the winner in this exemplary Poland, was neither foreign oppression, that of the KGB, nor libertarian insurrection, that of the KOR infiltrating Solidarnosc. It was the tacit consent of an entire people to the authority of the State, dominated and infiltrated though it is by the detested foreigner, the hereditary enemy, and anti-Christian though its ideology certainty is. For all that, it is still the State, the Authority, national sovereignty, that whereby Poland still exists. It is the fidelity of an entire people, under the pastoral crook of their primate, the true spiritual heir to Cardinal Wyszinski, and beyond that to Cardinal Sapieha, to their true religion, which is not that of man, of his rights and freedom, but that of Jesus Christ, poor and persecuted, obedient even unto death . . . and thus victorious!

Poland's path will doubtless still be long and painful like the Way of the Cross, and scattered with temptations and provocations from East and West. At least it is an example of political and moral realism to be followed by all oppressed peoples, as opposed to revolutionary aberrations be they of Jewish or Christian inspiration, trotskyite or liberal, based on race or class. For the principle of divine Law is that we should "seek first the Kingdom of God and its righteousness" and that "all these other things will be added unto us". Just as the principle of human wisdom, according to A. Comte and Charles Maurras, is that "Submission is the foundation of perfection". If in 1944, France had awaited the hour of her deliverance in discipline and fidelity, instead of allowing herself to be infiltrated and lured by the worst of the worst into anarchy and crime, we would not be where we are now and where Catholic Poland would soon have joined us had she followed the stooges of Solidarnosc, the KOR people, who only dream of liberation from harsh oppression in order to subject the country to an irreparable and totalitarian judeo-atheist anarchy.

A disastrous course for South Africa

(from The Daily Telegraph, July 19th, 1985)

From Prof. A. R. C. de Crespigny

SIR—In your leader (July 13) you rightly point out: "For many South Africans it is a bitter and incomprehensible irony that after a number of reforms have been introduced, they should now be punished by the country (United States) which they most admire."

In so far as the political purpose of economic sanctions against South Africa was to secure black government, they would be a futile exercise, even if such sanctions were to take their most damaging forms.

To coerce a person successfully, it is necessary that he should be brought to consider the alternative he would otherwise have preferred less eligible than the alternative one wishes him to choose. If enfranchised South Africans, including mixed-blood Coloureds and Indians, are to be successfully coerced, they must be brought to believe that the preservation of the essentials of the *status quo* is a less eligible alternative than a policy of universal adult suffrage.

But is it likely that non-black South Africans generally would prefer to accommodate black political demands rather than put up with coercion, even if it were to take it most serious forms? In answering this crucial question the state of mind of those non-blacks — the overwhelming majority — who support the new constitutional arrangements (which exclude blacks from the central government) must be examined.

In considering the desirability of black enfranchisement at the level of national government, the representative non-black South African would tend to reason somewhat as follows:

Strictly limited voting concessions which preserved the essentials of the *status quo* would not for long satisfy the blacks or their supporters. They would be interpreted merely as evidence of weakness and would soon be followed by more spirited and more formidable opposition. Universal suffrage would lead not to a sharing of power between blacks and non-blacks but to black domination.

If guarantees of minority rights were written into a new constitution, they would soon be abrogated or ignored. Under black domination, the position of non-blacks would be generally intolerable. They would lose much of their wealth, particularly those who owned land; their civilisation and their group identities would be progressively detroyed; they would be compelled to live on terms of social equality with blacks; the economy and the administrative structure of the state would be plunged into chaos; many non-blacks would want to leave the country; those who remained would risk becoming victims of hideous acts of revenge.

A black-governed South Africa would not be remotely democratic, and would probably be controlled by Marxists. In such a society all sections of the population, including the blacks themselves, would be subject to the tyranny of a new black elite, which would be brutal, corrupt and incompetent.

If the above description is a fair portrayal of his thinking, it seems plain that the representative non-black South African would put up with a great deal of insecurity and material loss rather than opt for a course which he believes can lead only to disaster.

A. R. C. de CRESPIGNY
Shaftesbury, Dorset.

CHOICE — for race and nation. Edited by The Dowager Lady Birdwood. Issue 15 now available. Send 2 x 13p. stamps to Choice, 32A Anselm Road, London S.W.6.

BATS IN THE EPISCOPAL BELFRY

by NOEL HUNT

We are told that Bishop Desmond Tutu (the media have made it obligatory to add "winner of the Nobel Peace Prize" whenever his name is mentioned) has been in the United States. He was making what was described as "a stand against apartheid". This is, of course, one way of describing what to many looks like treason. The stand against apartheid apparently took the form of speeches urging American firms to withdraw their investments in South African industry.

The religion which the Bishop professes and which provides such a comfortable living allied to endless opportunities for well-publicised meddling and mischief-making, requires him to be charitable and merciful. So it is a little surprising to think that if the Americans take the Bishop's advice the first sufferers will be the blacks on whose behalf he is allegedly campaigning. When asked whether "disinvestment" would not mean black unemployment and suffering, the Bishop was reported to have answered, "I would rather live in control of my destiny than in clover." Even by the Bishop's high standards of nonsense, this is a notable piece of empty claptrap. Like so many of his utterances, it sounds impressive, while meaning very little. It is not even original: the thought was previously enunciated by the late Patrice Lumumba, Congolese Prime Minister and embezzler. It also makes it plain that the Bishop either does not know or chooses to ignore the realities of life in Africa.

Never In Control

History tells us that the Bishop will never be in control of his destiny. If he and his revolutionary chums have their way — and given the abject abdication of the South African whites it looks more and more as if they will — the inhabitants of "Azania" will each have a vote. The Bishop will thus be one of about ten million voters. Why does he think that his single vote will "put him in control of his destiny"? Quite clearly it will do nothing of the sort. It is a surprising thought, too, from a Bishop of the Anglican Church. As a Christian, presumably he believes that his destiny is controlled by his Maker, not by a ballot box?

The Bishop's statement seems to ignore all the evidence from the rest of Africa. This evidence shows that when given a vote blacks tend to cast it on strictly tribal, i.e. racial, lines. The same pattern will emerge, no doubt, in "Azania". If it does, then it is certain that the Bishop will not be in control of anything, certainly not of his destiny. The reason is tribal. The Bishop is a Fingo by tribe. The Fingoes are not, properly speaking, a tribe. They are merely a mish-mash descended from the survivors of the bloody tribal wars connected with the rise of Zulu power. Their very name is a corruption of a Zulu word, meaning "a slave". Even if the Fingoes were seen by the other blacks as a tribe, there are not enough of them to give themselves any electoral significance. Another difficulty to a Fingo wishing to control his own destiny is that very nearly the only point on which all South African blacks agree is their universal dislike and distrust of the Fingoes. They will never vote a Fingo into a position of power while they can vote for one of their own. Thus, it seems clear that if the blacks ever control South Africa, Bishop Tutu, Peace Prize or not, will never "live in control of his own destiny". The other tribes will control him, not he them.

Of course, to talk as if the blacks will control South Africa is in the highest degree ingenuous. It is true that the glove manipulating the puppet strings may be black, but the hand inside the glove will be white. For instance, does anyone seriously think that President Kaunda actually rules Zambia? In terms of real power, the Board of the copper mines has far-more "clout" than the President. Pondering on this fact, one begins to understand Kaunda's habit of weeping while being interviewed on television. One wonders why Bishop Tutu ("winner of the Nobel Peace Prize") thinks that he will be allowed to control his destiny when President Kaunda cannot control his own. If another instance is needed, consider Angola. It is ostensibly black-ruled and independent. Is the Bishop really so naif as to think that the Angolans, or for that matter the Cuban mercenaries infesting the country, have the last word in Angolan affairs? He must know that this word is uttered in Moscow, not in Luanda. Why, then, does he think that things will be different in "Azania"?

Every single "independent" state in Africa is controlled from elsewhere, be it the Kremlin or Wall Street. Yet Bishop Tutu professes to believe that he will be allowed to control his own destiny. Anyone with a knowledge of recent African history holding such a belief must be either a fool or a rogue. Faith has been unkindly defined as "believing what one knows to be untrue". If he believes that the black man in South Africa will be allowed to make his own

decisions then Bishop Tutu is moving from the realms of faith into those of fantasy.

The Bishop has travelled widely in Africa. He must be well aware, then, of the massive misery and poverty of most of Africa, directly attributable to the withdrawal of the white man. This is the fate which he is apparently prepared to see overtake his own presently prosperous and well-governed country. Poverty, starvation and misery are in his eyes as nothing compared with the possession of a vote and "freedom". Freedom from what? Freedom to do what? On these points the Bishop is silent.

We were told that Bishop Tutu made his "stand against apartheid" at that fount of American protest, Berkeley University. As a piquant footnote to the report, we read that one of those who supported him was a Jewish Professor of Judaism. She was reported as "having been convinced that now was the time and that this [apartheid] was the issue". Students of the absurd will relish this titbit. Here we have one of a people who have remained the immensely talented and gifted race they are by the rigorous practice of racial segregation, attacking South Africa for having had the good sense to do what her own people do. She has not been moved to protest, it seems, by the fact that today in Israel non-Jews may not live or trade in more than ninety per cent of the area of the country. These state-owned lands are for occupation by Jews only; and very sensible too, one might think.

To this Professor of Judaism it seems that Defence Regulations setting up state-owned lands in Israel are quite in order, while the South African Group Areas Act setting aside land for racial occupation is evil beyond words. One might be forgiven for concluding that, at least at Berkeley University, racial separation is laudable when practised by Israel but indefensible when practised by South Africa. What a pity that the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize did not know about the Israeli state-owned lands. He could have included a denunciation of Israel's race laws in his "stand against apartheid" and then kicked the Professor of Judaism off his band-wagon!

MR. BOTHA'S MACHIAVELLIAN SCHEME

The storm of indignation sweeping the world as the South African Government *appears* to be trying to restore normality is essentially manufactured. By choosing in 1961 to embark on an isolationist role, South Africa became a threat to the success of the proposed take-over of the world. Although Dr. Verwoerd's leadership was terminated and a remorseless vendetta launched against the country's separatist racial policy, it has remained the principle obstacle in the one-world way of conquest.

At first sight, President Botha's declaration of a state of emergency is heartening. But *is* it quite the defiant stand against the subversion of South Africa's integrity that it seems?

The Daily Telegraph's Christopher Munnion suggested several months ago that Mr. Botha, in fact, is actually intent on bringing about a change in apartheid from within, working broadly to a script devised by the liberal Professor Samuel Huntingdon of Harvard University. Drawing freely on Machiavelli, the Professor, an international authority on the strategy of reform, addressed leading members of the National Party Government in 1981 on the means by which "reform" (i.e. the dismantling of apartheid) might be introduced insidiously, so that the suspicions of the electorate would not be aroused.

According to Munnion, Huntingdon said the reformer "must be ready to welcome and even use violence when it serves his purposes since it is usually necessary in order to . . . put through reforms". Could this mean that by using the A.N.C.-inspired violence in black townships as an excuse, *Botha himself* intends to put the final nail in the coffin of the apartheid system? The Mixed Marriages and Immorality Acts have already been jettisoned. However much they are disguised, further reforms to "alleviate injustices" could lead only to greater integration.

Are we being unduly pessimistic? Certainly Professor Huntingdon advised leaders of the National Party that support for reform from the Whites "may depend upon *inaccurate* assumptions as to its consequences," and he quoted Machiavelli: "Whoever wishes to reform an existing government in a free state should at least preserve the semblance of the old forms." If Mr. Botha *is* employing ambiguity, concealment and deception in his response to the present crisis, the country's very survival is at stake.

INFLATION AND DEFLATION

by FR. DENIS FAHEY

Economics is the science which studies the component cells of the State, namely, families, in the constituent relations of their members and in their conditions of existence.

It aims at elucidating, *primarily*, the personal relations which constitute the family, the relations of husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants, and then, *secondarily*, the relations that follow from the conditions of existence of the family, namely the mutual relations of human persons arising from their need of external goods or real wealth.

On the one hand, our nature brings us into relation with earthly resources which, by taking account of their nature and laws, we have to transform into real wealth capable of satisfying our corporal needs. Such are the relations of men with minerals, stone, lime, copper, iron, petrol; with the flora and fauna that people the earth, air and water; with the nerves and muscles of our own bodies.

On the other hand, from this necessary utilisation of things follow personal social relations between us: relations between cultivators of the soil and artisans, between employers and employed, between industrialists and merchants, between buyers and sellers. All these relations, however, are between human persons whose well-being is bound up with strong family life.

Needless to say, the organisation of family life, in view of providing its members with sufficient material resources, is, though secondary, a very important element of economics. As St. Thomas Aquinas points out, a sufficiency of material goods is necessary for the virtuous life of the average human being: "That a man may lead a virtuous life two things are required. The chief requisite is virtuous action, for virtue is that by which one leads a good life. The other requisite, which is secondary and quasi-instrumental in character, is a sufficiency of material goods, the use of which is necessary for virtuous action." *De Regibinie Principum*, Lib. I, Cap. XV.

Natural wealth

Economics, then, will study firstly, the constituent relations of the members of Christ, who compose the family; secondly, the science of the production, distribution and exchange of natural wealth, in view of securing that sufficiency of material goods which is normally indispensable for the virtuous life of members of families; thirdly, the auxiliary art of the manipulation of money or artificial wealth, which is meant to facilitate families in procuring by exchange the above-mentioned sufficiency.

According to right order, then, money or exchange medium is for the production of material goods for the virtuous life of members of Christ of which the foundation is laid in the Christian family.

Money, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, was invented by the art of man for the convenience of exchange by serving as a common measure of things saleable. "Natural wealth," he writes, "is that by which natural wants are supplied, for example, food, drink, clothing, vehicles, dwellings and such like.

Artificial wealth

"Artificial wealth is that which is not a direct help to nature, as for instance, money. This was invented by the art of man, for the convenience of exchange by serving as a common measure of things saleable." As a common measure it ought to be *stable*.

"As a measure used for estimating the value of things, "writes St. Thomas, "money must keep the same value, since the value of all things must be expressed in terms of money. Thus exchanges can readily take place and, as a consequence, communications between men are facilitated."

Money is, therefore, essentially an exchange medium. Stability in value is a property or necessary attribute of an exchange medium. Money is meant to facilitate families in procuring by exchange the sufficiency of material goods for the virtuous life of the human personalities composing them. The virtuous life of human persons is simply their ordered development in Supernatural Life as members of Christ.

Right order

Accordingly, as practical sciences or arts are arranged in hierarchical order of their ends, the art of the manipulation of money must be at the service of politics and economics. Those who are skilled in the manipulation of money must be the servants of the State, not the dictators of governmental policy; they must aim at aiding and strengthening family life, not at disrupting it for the sake of the figures in their ledgers.

It is completely against order if the production and the distribution of the goods needed by families must conform to the exigencies of money-making instead of the other way round.

If, by a perversion of the right order, money or exchange medium becomes the master, production and distribution will decay, the potentialities of the State's resources will not be realised, and family life will suffer. If the manipulators of money get control of the Government of the State, then the Government will not be able to compel the bankers and the money changers to practise the virtue of social justice, namely, that justice which has for object the common good, and the welfare of the whole nation will suffer grievously. Usury and alteration of the price level will then be permitted to go unchecked, and the real sovereignty in the State will inevitably pass into the hands of the manipulators of money.

The next stage will be a move to bring national sovereignty under the domination of some international organisation subject to finance. That will make permanent and world-wide the present-day anti-Christian and anti-natural perversion of order involved in the subordination of human persons to the production of material goods and in the subordination of the production and distribution of material goods to finance.

State's duty

For St. Thomas, it is duty of the State to see that money or exchange medium is a stable measure of value. In other words, just as the State must maintain stable measures of weight and length, in view of commutative justice in buying and selling, so it must aim at stability of the price level, the price of things being the expression of its exchange value in terms of money.

"It is true," writes St. Thomas, "that it is the same with money as with other things, namely that one does not always get what one wants for it, because it is not always endowed with the same purchasing power, that is, it is not always of the same value. But, nevertheless, matters should be so arranged that it should be steadier in value than other things . . . As a measure used for estimating the value of other things, *money must keep the same value,* since the value of all things must be expressed in terms of money. Thus exchanges can readily take place and, as a consequence, communications between men are facilitated."

The stronger will

(from The Daily Telegraph, July 1st, 1985)

SIR—Mr. E. Grattan stressing that our behavioural troubles are not limited to football fans, has pinpointed the lack of adult authority which caused them. We are, I submit, suffering from a generation or more of self-indulgent parents who are more concerned with the material things in life than with the upbringing of their children.

The first lesson they need to learn themselves, and to teach their children is that their will is stronger than that of the child, and that anything for a quiet life (including television) will not be an adequate substitute. To be effective, this lesson begins at birth and continues throughout adolescence.

The second lesson they (and teachers) need to learn is that example is the best teacher.

Until mothers get back into their homes and give their children the loving care and attention they need and deserve, there is little hope of much improvement. Admittedly single-parent families are at a disadvantage in this respect, but it has to be remembered that the majority of these have been brought about by a deliberate disregard or very little respect for the sacrament of marriage.

It is going to be a long haul back.

F. BARTER,
Rowlands Castle, Hants.

VICTIM OF TREACHERY

Sir Christopher Medlycott has been reported in *The Daily Telegraph* as wanting a celebration for the five hundredth anniversary of the battle of Bosworth Field, which resulted in the death of King Richard III. "It is appropriate that the battle should be remembered."

Remembered, certainly, but *not* celebrated in the way Sir Christopher desires. For we would not be wearing Tudor roses — rather, black armbands in memory of that last and potentially best of the English Plantagenets, the victim of treachery, not loyalty at Bosworth. The battle put an end to what might well have become a just and enlightened reign, opening the door to the appalling Tudor dynasy, with their record of repression, double-dealing, debauchery, arrogance and greed.

The Universal Teleological Society. For details send £1 to Allen & Co., Bracewell House, 14 Hodden Avenue, Blackpool FY1 6NS.

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

Two adjacent items in the parish newsletter of St. George's R.C. Church, Walthamstow, caught my eye. The first announced the closure of the youth club due to disturbances that resulted in the police being called. The second informed parishioners of the next meeting of the "Justice and Peace" Group. No doubt the latter body gathers together regularly, as similar ones do elsewhere, to put right South Africa and Chile, to urge "justice" for Nicaragua, anti-nuclear "peace and harmony" world-wide, and admission for immigrants *from* world-wide. But as for bringing peace to their own parish youth club . . . *failure!*

* * * *

Isn't it madly funny (and I *do* mean mad) that there have been all the comparisons between the money raised by the "Live Aid" catterwauling and what the Government has given to Ethiopia? Mrs. Thatcher's Ministers reply indignantly that *they* have given x-millions — *and* they feel no need to apologise for it. High time somebody mentioned that the people who provide the Government with money to dole out overseas are also keeping most of the rock fans in board and keep through the Ill-fare State.

* * * *

Isn't Common Market bureaucracy comforting? Last year, the Government became unhappy with existing safety standards for pushchairs after a series of accidents involving injuries to toddlers. So the Department of Trade looked into ways of tightening standards and drew up new negulations. Then they hit a snag. The European Commission said the new standards were "too stringent" and some foreign pushchair manufacturers wouldn't be able to comply. This constituted "an unfair barrier to trade". Upshot is that our craven Government has dropped its plans, leaving thousands of little children at risk.

* * * *

A quick check in my Penny Catechism shows that the Lord's Prayer contains 56 words and the Ten Commandments 137. I think I learnt at school that the American Declaration of Independence said it all in 300 words. Yet one of the latest E.E.C. regulations — on the use of caramel and the importation of caramel products — stretches to an amazing 26,972 words! As the Immortal Bard once observed, the long-winded author "draweth out the thread of his verbositie, finer than the staple of his argument".

The tissues I normally buy at my local Gateway supermarket have had printed on the box: "100 White Man Size Tissues". On puprchasing my latest supply with the onset of a summer sniffle, I noticed that the description had been altered to: "100 Man Size Tissues — White". Proof, I suppose, that Gateway's deference to its non-white customers isn't to be sneezed at! When will the feminists have it altered to "Person Size"?

* * * *

The labourer is worthy of his hire — especially so if he is a judge, top civil servant or general. in Mrs. Thatcher's eyes, Is it *really* to be assumed that judges will dispense justice, defence chiefs develop coherent strategies and permanent secretaries effectively administer affairs of state *only* if vastly increased pay beckons from the top? Surely a just society requires that those at the very summit of their careers should accept *some* share of the burdens experienced by the less privileged if the concept of "service" is to retain anything of its original meaning? That said, I wonder if we shall be treated to a similar exhibition of uproar by Mr. Hattersley *et al* when M.P.s announce their own next whopping pay rise?

MR. ALBERT ELDER

With sadness we record Albert Elder's death. He supported loyally *Candour* and the A.K.C. Academy. An Orthodox Jew, his belief in the importance of race led him to stand for the National Front in Hendon South in 1979. Two years before, he braved the Red mob to march through Lewisham. We salute his passing.

Candour

Subscription Rates

	Per Annum	
U.K. - - -	£4.50	
Overseas - -	£5.00	Airmail
U.S. Dollar Rate	$10.00	,,

FOREST HOUSE. LISS FOREST. HANTS GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.